

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/629,254	WU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dangelino N. Gortayo	2168	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Dangelino N. Gortayo. (3) Rick D. Nydegger ( 28651 )  
 (2) Debbie Le. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 28 March 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 25, 41.

Identification of prior art discussed: LaRue (US Patent 6,401,104 B1).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
3/28/06  
 Examiner's signature, if required

DG

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Appicants' representative proposed amendments to claim 25 to clarify and more clearly define the data structure of the catalog <sup>which is</sup> is then used to map data from the data store layer (physical table - see Fig. 1) to a logical view in the synchronization layer, where the logical view is substantially similar to the logical view of other platforms so that synchronization can be carried out notwithstanding the different physical storage parameters of the different platforms. New claim 42 to a corresponding computer program product appears to overcome the 101 issue. These claims appear to define over the art of record, although the examiner will update the search before making any final determination of patentability..